DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 063 EC 103 371

AUTHOR Minton, Judith
TITLE Summer 1976 Program for Deaf Children: Evaluation Report, Evaluation Period, July 2-August 13, 1976.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO B/E-09-71605
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 24p.; Contains some light print

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aurally Handicapped; *Deaf; Educational Objectives; Elementary Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Summer Programs

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of a summer project for 110 deaf children (5-14 years old) describes findings in terms of project objectives. Analysis of objectives is said to indicate that intellectual growth took place for most of the Ss during the program and that the success ratio for achieving mastery was high. Eight recommendations are listed, including greater emphasis on language oriented objectives. Statistical data on student performance is appended. (CL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED148063

EVALUATION REPORT

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

B/E #09-71505

Summer 1976 Program

for

Deaf Children

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: EC | TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Evaluation Period

July 2 - August 13, 1976

Consultant/Evaluator

Dr. Judith Minton

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the Summer 1976.

EC103371

DR. ANTHONY J. POLEMENI, DIRECTOR

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Chapter I	Program Description	1
Chapter II	Program Objectives	2
	Evaluation Objectives	2
	Evaluation Objective #1	2
	Subjects	2
	Methods and Procedures	2
	Data Analysis	3
	Time Schedule	3
	Evaluation Objective #2	3
	Subjects	3
	Methods and Procedures	3
	Data Analysis	3
	Evaluation Objective #3	3
	Data Analysis	4
	Data Loss	4
	Methodological Limitations	4
Chapter III	Findings	5
	Objective #1	5
	Objective #2	5
	Evaluation #3	7
Chapter IV	Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations	9

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table "A"	Distribution of pupil mastery by instructional objectives as a result of instruction	11
Table "B"	Distribution of the number of instructional objectives mastered after instruction	11
Table "C"	Distribution of percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives	12

Appendixes

Mailed Information Report (MIR)
Data Loss Form

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR DEAF CHILDREN

Chapter 1. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The program is designed to provide for the education of 110 deaf children many who entered school late. The participants in this program are profoundly deaf from ages 5 to 14. A major portion of these children come from non-English speaking or bilingual homes and need additional assistance in communication skills development. Participants are regarded as educationally disadvantaged in view of their late entrance to school and their handicap, which in most cases is present at birth. Because a large mass of sensory stimulation is denied to these children, intellectual development is slower than in the hearing child. Added to this, these children have no access to spoken language. Without an intensive program during the summer, it is assumed that there would be regression in academic skills developed during the winter.

The summer program operated for 28 days from July 2 to August 13, 3½ hours each day at the School for the Deaf, JHS 47M. A one day general orientation program to criterion referenced testing was provided for the teachers. A teacher-in-charge, assisted by a general assistant, organized the program, planned orientation sessions and supervised all aspects of the program, employing a staff of 17 teachers, three school aides, three educational assistants and one school secretary. Classes were small groups organized to provide: development of communication skills; language development and language arts; reading and mathematics instruction; cultural enrichment; art activities and dramatic play; crafts; all of which are aimed to enhance reading and mathematic skills development. This program was also designed to provide a Special Tutorial Class (emotionally disturbed deaf, H=3) and a class for pupils with retarded mental development. One specially trained teacher was in each of these

classes which were conducted in Total Communication.

Chapter II Evaluation Objectives

Program Objective #1: To help pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading and mathematics which they fail prior to instruction as measured by appropriate objectives from Houghton Mifflin (Reading) and the BASE (Mathematics) Criterion Referenced Tests.

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

Evaluation Objective #1: To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70% of the participants demonstrate mastery of at least one instructional objective in reading and mathematics which, prior to participation in the program, they did not master.

Subjects: All participants in the program.

Methods and Procedures: Pupils were assigned to classes on the basis of school records and teachers' judgement. Each teacher in the program is an experienced teacher of the deaf and all teachers within the summer program taught at the School for the Deaf during the school year. Since nearly all the pupils attend the school during the year, individual cognitive capabilites and probable mastery levels were initially fairly well known to the teachers. All participants in the program were administered criterion referenced tests, developed by Houghton Mifflin (Reading) and the BASE (Mathematics) on a pre-post test basis by the classroom teacher. In order to have passed an instructional objective on the pre-test, the child must have responded correctly to 100% of the stimulus items. No post-test was then required for this objective. For each instructional objective diagnosed as needing remediation, a post-test was administered to the child. If a child received 30% of the pre-test, correct responses to 80-100% of the stimulus items indicated mastery of that objective on the post-test. If a child correctly responded to 80% of the stimulus items within an objective, he was required to pass 100% of the items for mastery level. Parallel

forms of the selected tests were used for pre and post testing. For each instructional objective, results of passing and failing on both the pre-test and post-test were recorded for each child in the class by the classroom teacher.

Data Analysis: Data were analyzed to determine the percentage of participants demonstrating mastery or non-mastery of each instructional objective (according to SED classification system) at initial and final testing. The percentage of pupils passing one or more objectives in reading and mathematics was ascertained.

Time Schedule: The pre-test was administered during the first week of the program. The post-test was administered at intervals deemed appropriate by the classroom teacher in terms of assumed cognitive gains of the child.

Evaluation Objective #2: To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.

Subjects: Same as above

Methods and Procedures: Same as above

Data Analysis: Data were analyzed and presented in narrative and tabular form to ascertain each of the following:

A. The distribution of pupil mastery as a result of instruction by instructional objectives (Table A).

B. The distribution of the number of objectives mastered as a result of instruction (Table B).

C. The distribution of percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives (Table C).

Evaluation Objective #3: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Data Analysis: Observations of the program, the staff and facilities took place throughout the length of the program.

Data Loss: There was one child in the program who attended too few sessions to participate either in the pre- or post-testing.

Methodological Limitations: Instructors who teach for mastery are also the same people who test for mastery. For many implications relating to measurement theory, this will tend to limit conclusions from data.

Chapter III. Findings

Objective #1: Did 70% of the pupils master at least one instructional objective during the program?

Table B yields positive results indicating that the desired achievement gain took place. Ninety percent of the children mastered at least one reading objective and 72 percent of the children mastered one mathematics objective. It is evident that intellectual growth took place for most of the children during the summer.

These results are outstanding in the light of the particular academic handicap of these children. These children are critically handicapped in understanding the structure and semantics of language. The material that the teachers are provided with are not geared to the needs of this special population but are downward extensions of material for hearing children. If each objective is analyzed into individual steps needed for task mastery, it must be realized how much more difficult each component activity is to achieve for these largely language and speech deprived children.

The program is almost completely directed to cognitive instruction. Observation of the classroom sessions reveals that the staff was hard-working and dedicated. There are few materials available which can service this special population of children. This is particularly true in reading. Because the experience each deaf child brings is much more individual and unique, each class is more heterogenous in composition than a similiar classroom of hearing children. Instruction must be individually geared and this is accomplished largely with teacher-made materials.

Objective #2: To what extent did pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives as a result of participation in the program? This objective may be determined by analyzation of several program records.

a). What were the average number of objectives achieved by the children?

The average number of Reading Objectives achieved by each child was 2.5. The range of objective achieved by individuals in reading extended from 0 to 7 (Table B). The average number of Mathematic Objectivesachieved by each child was 1.5. The range of objectives achieved in mathematics extended from 0 to 5 (Table B). This number was achieved even though, for a few of the older children, there appeared to be a ceiling effect. This occurred when a child passed many of the objectives on the pre-test. That child may then be listed as attaining only one objective, but the particular objective achieved may have been a very difficult one to achieve. It also may have been the only one left to attain in the battery. The very youngest children in the program had difficulty in demonstrating mastery of objectives. According to one teacher, "Unfortunately the objectives are not geared to the young deaf child". This comment about the lack of reality of the objectives was also made for the deaf CRMD child.

b). What was the percentage of the pupil achieving mastery after attempting mastery?

Observation of Table A indicates that the success ratio was very high. Table C gives similiar evidence. It indicates that the teachers accurately judged the capabilities and potential of the students in the program.

c). To what extent did children pass objectives, either in reading or mathematics?

Only 4 children in the entire test population (N = 113) passed no objective, either in reading or mathematics.

The aforementioned indicate that the objectives sought by this program are for the most part realistic and capable of attainment by this special population of children.

Evaluation #3: To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal. The program sessions were in operation from July 6 to August 12. On July 1 an orientation session was held for the teachers. Classroom sessions lasted from 9:00 to 12:30. Classes were organized by different age and achievement levels, and into different types of communication systems: Total communication, Sign Language. There were 17 classrooms with a pupil-teacher ratio of between 5:1 and 8:1. The kindergarten classroom contained 11 children. There were 3 Educational Assistants and 3 School Aides.

By the end of July the actual number of registrants was 114. All children enrolled in the School for the Deaf receive applications to the Summer Program. Children are enrolled into the program as their application is received by the school. It appears as if there is an adequate number of places in the program to accommodate all who apply for entrance. The program was staffed, organized and implemented as planned.

Attendance in the early part of July was poor (i.e.: July 8, N=50). This resulted from the fact that there was a change from small wagons to large buses for pick-up. This meant that there were 10 buses for 350 stops (including children from other schools) all over the city. Children were waiting at the bus stop from 7:00 in the morning and on. In the first week some were never picked up. This disorganization wasted valuable academic time for the children. The bus problem also seemed to hamper field trips for some classes. The children did not have adequate time to go on field trips because the bus problem made planning difficult.

Nearly all the time in the program is devoted to instructional time. There is an art room to which the children go, and a playground which is used by the younger children. The teachers utilize all activities (i.e.: cooking, drawing) to increase the language capabilities of these children which in turn, will be reflected in raised academic skills. Some teachers felt that the children could use a play time each day.

Because of the nature of the instruction, nearly all instructional materi are teacher created. Teachers felt that because of the general unavailability of instructional materials which are realistic and appropriate for these childre , not enough money was allocated for supplies for teacher-made materials (Code 1 . Teachers also felt that they should be informed earlier of their classroom assignment. This will allow them preparation time, before the start of the pr am, to prepare materials which would be needed.

There was criticism of the tests used. As mentioned, teachers of younge children felt that the test objectives were too difficult. They would like to see readiness items included so that younger children can find it easier to attain mastery on many of the items. All teachers felt that language develop-ment is more important to these children and the tests, requiring very specifi academic skills, were directing the program away from what is basically needed by these children. In some instances the tests were beyond the capabilities o the children (i.e.: requiring phonic skills which were difficult given the han cap of these children). Some of the teachers felt that the tests, although it made the curriculum uniform, took away from an experience and language-type of curriculum.

Although many of the teachers felt the orientation program was, in genera excellent and informative, many expressed criticism that (a) the materials were poorly distributed (b) there were not enough seats (c) there was no time for individual questions and answers. The teachers did not appear to experience a difficulty in recording or using criteria referenced tests.

Most teachers felt that the facilities and arrangements were adequate.

The physical plant was in the process of renovation which produced some, but not major, difficulties. There was some complaint that there were not eno bathroom facilities, but this will be remediated as soon as the renovation is completed.

Where possible last year's recommendation was implemented. They were as follows:

Recommendation/Findings	Implementations
1. It was recommended that time be provided for thorough instruction of the professional staff in criterion-referenced testing.	1. A one-session workshop for teacher training was conducted on criterion-referenced testing.
2. The program received a favorable evaluation. Continuation was recommended.	2. Program was recycled.
3. A valid testing instrument is needed for deaf children whose hearing deficit results in a handicap of communication skills.	3. No such instrument was available.

Chapter IV

Summary of Major Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations:

Major Findings: The program was instituted as written. The administrative and teaching staff appear capable and dedicated. There seem to be only minor areas needing remediation.

Conclusion: This program gives evidence that it was academically beneficial to youngsters who attended. Their handicap reduces stimulation which is difficult for families to replace at home. Given Piaget's notion that stimulation is the aliment upon which intellectual growth takes place, there may have been academic regression for many of these children if they had not entered this program. This did not take place. In contrast, it was noted that there was academic growth.

Recommendations: Given observations and the test data, the following recommendations appear reasonable:

1. Transportation to and from the school should be handled by smaller vehicles carrying fewer children.

2. More language oriented objectives should be incorporated into the curriculum rather than only objectives specifically for reading and math. There must be more recognition of the role of language in the instruction of deaf children.
3. The tests used should cover a wider range of skills. Readiness skills should be added and so should more difficult objectives be included for the brighter older children. Also, special realistic objectives should be determined for the CRMD child.
4. More money should be allocated for supplies which individual teachers could use in making instructional materials.
5. One more educational assistant could be provided who would be responsible for supervising outdoor play. This would allow the classroom teacher to individually instruct children who need extra assistance, during the class play period.
6. The Orientation Program, although successful, could be improved in the following ways:
    a) The materials could be better distributed beforehand.
    b) It could be divided into 2 segments. A large audience session could be conducted prior to breaking up into small groups under the direction of the individual supervisors using the tests the teacher will use.
7. Teachers should be informed of their class assignments as early as possible since so many of the materials they use are teacher-made.
8. The program is necessary for these children and should be recycled.

TABLE "A"

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION

Instructional Objective	Ratio of # pupils achieving mastery / # pupils attempting mastery	Percentage of Mastery
	Reading	
2105	49/49	100
2106	7/7	100
2107	3/3	100
2109	12/12	100
2203	49/50	98
2205	39/41	95
2305	0/0	0
2404	31/33	93
2406	32/32	100
2408	18/20	90
2412	44/44	100
	Mathematics	
1101	37/44	84
1103	42/42	100
1107	32/33	96
1108	25/25	100
1109	2/2	100
1205	40/40	100
1302	5/6	83
1306	30/31	96
1902	6/8	75

TABLE "B"

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION

Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
	Reading	
7-8	2	2
5-6	15	14
3-4	36	31
1-2	49	43
None	11	10
	N = 113	
	Mathematics	
5-6	3	2
3-4	20	17
1-2	58	52
None	32	29
	N = 113	

TABLE "C"

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS ACHIEVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives (# Objectives Achieved / # Objectives Attempted)	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
Reading		
90-100%	98	86
80-89%	1	1
70-79%	1	1
60-69%	1	1
50-59%	1	1
40-49%	0	0
30-39%	0	0
20-29%	0	0
10-19%	0	0
0-9%	11	10
	N = 113	
Mathematics		
90-100%	76	67
80-89%	0	0
70-79%	2	2
60-69%	1	1
50-59%	2	2
40-49%	0	0
30-39%	0	0
20-29%	0	0
10-19%	0	0
0-9%	32	28
	N = 113	

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM
Function #09-71605

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed N	%	Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	Number/ Reason
6 0 8 6 1 5 0	7 2 0	50	Houghton Mifflin (74)	114	113	1	1	Attended too few sessions	1
6 0 9 6 1 5 0	7 2 0	50	BASE	114	113	1	1	Attended too few sessions	1

The University of the State of New York
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Bureau of Urban and Community Programs Evaluation
Albany, New York 12234

MAILED INFORMATION REPORT FOR CATEGORICALLY AIDED EDUCATION PROJECTS

SECTION II

Summer 1976

Due Date: September 15, 1976

SED Project Number: | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 | 0 | 0 | | 7 | 6 | | 6 | 0 | 0 | | 6 | S |

BE Function Number (N.Y.C. only): | 0 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 |

Project Title: Summer 1976 Program for Deaf Children

School District Name DSEPPS - District 75

School District Address 110 Livingston Street

Brooklyn, New York 11201

Name and Title of Person Completing this form:

Name Judith Minton, Ph.D.

Title Evaluator

Telephone Number 516 (Area Code) 431-8149

Date this form was completed 9 / 15 / 76 .

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
6086150	2105	Houghton Mifflin	1	32	42	38*	0*
6086150	2203	"	"	29	49	46	1
6086150	2205	"	"	10	41	38	2
6086150	2404	"	"	29	35	29	2
6086150	2406	"	"	11	32	30	0
6086150	2408	"	"	11	22	18	2
6086150	2412	"	"	6	39	35	0
6086150	2105	"	2	5	11	11	0
6086150	2106	Houghton Mifflin	"	8	7	7	0
6086150	2107	"	"	11	5	3	0
6086150	2109	"	"	7	12	12	0
6086150	2203	"	"	14	5	3	0
6086150	2205	"	"	14	1	1	0
6086150	2305	"	"	11	1	0	0
6086150	2404	"	"	6	3	2	0
6086150	2406	"	"	6	1	2	0
6086150	2408	"	"	11	0	0	0
6088150	2412	"	"	1	9	9	0

*Pupils no retested wherever a discrepancy exists between Col.2 and Posttest results.

B/L #09-71605 M-1

Component Code	Instructional Mastery Code	Publisher	Level	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
6096150	1101	BASE	!	33	26	18	7
6096150	1103	"	"	3	26	26	0
6096150	1107	"	"	18	16	12	0
6096150	1108	"	"	17	10	9	0
6096150	1205	"	"	2	13	12	0
6096150	1305	"	"	5	29	28	0
6096150	1306	"	"	1	17	11	1
6096150	1101	BASE	2	25	19	19	0
6096150	1103	"	"	9	16	16	0
6096150	1107	"	"	10	20	20	0
6096150	1108	"	"	4	16	16	0
6096150	1109	"	"	3	2	2	0
6096150	1205	"	"	5	28	28	0
6096150	1302	"	"	1	7	5	1
6096150	1305	"	"	8	7	7	0
6096150	1306	"	"	4	21	19	0

Program Abstract: This half-day, summer program provided for the education of 110 deaf children from the ages of 5 to 14. Participants may be regarded as educationally disadvantaged. The following were the stated cognitive objectives:

1) To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70% of the participants demonstrate mastery of at least one instructional objective in reading and mathematics which, prior to participation in the program, they did not master.

2) To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.

All objectives were investigated and demonstrated to have been successfully achieved. The results were considered attributable to dedicated teaching staff which individualizes instruction for each child. This is necessary because deafness makes the experience of each child unique. Instruction is largely accomplished through the use of teacher-made material because of the general paucity of materials available for use in teaching deaf children. Classes are small. This is a necessary condition for the type of learning necessary for children with this kind of impairment.